



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SD

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,356	11/19/2001	Tuomo Syvanne	P 284125 2011373US/A/kp	8355

909 7590 06/16/2005

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP  
P.O. BOX 10500  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/988,356

Applicant(s)

SYVANNE, TUOMO

Examiner

Christopher J. Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

20

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Freund US 2003/0167405.**

As per claims 1, 12, and 14

Freund teaches the ability to detect when a client is connected to different networks, and using different security settings depending on the network [0073]. Freund teaches determining the network the client is connected to in part by detecting the IP address, [0078], [0088]. Freund teaches the firewall determining between a trusted and untrusted network, [0097].

As per claim 2, Freund teaches providing the client with different rules, and enabling the rules depending on location, [0074].

As per claim 3, Freund teaches using one set of rules by changing groups [0080].

Art Unit: 2134

As per claim 4, and 5 Freund teaches storing the IP address off the home network and determining if the firewall is in said home network [0142], [0078], [0099].

As per claim 6, 13, and 15, Freund teaches verifying the current location of the client, based upon the IP address [0134].

As per claims 7, and 8 Freund teaches that the networks element responds when client is in the network of the current IP, and verifies this information also with a MAC address, [0078].

As per claim 10, Freund teaches that the user defines the networks in a trusted zone, and that when the mobile computer moves in from network to network, it queries the new network in the trusted zone,[0073], [0078].

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 9, 16, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Freund US 2003/0167405 in view of Schneier US 2002/0087882.**

As per claims 9, 16, 17, and 19

Art Unit: 2134

Freund teaches the ability to detect when a client is connected to different networks, and using different security settings depending on the network [0073]. Freund teaches determining the network the client is connected to in part by detecting the IP address, [0078], [0088]. Freund teaches the firewall determining between a trusted and untrusted network, [0097]. Freund does not teach updating the firewall rules via a centralized unit.

Schneier teaches a centralized unit manages updates to software including updates to firewall software, [0037].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the firewall system of Freund with the central firewall update system of Schneier because the central system allows all clients on the trusted system to maintain the same security policy.

**Claims 11, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Freund US 2003/0167405 in view of Sheikh US 2002/0078382**

As per claims 11, 18, and 20

Freund teaches maintaining a log, [0141]. Freund does not teach updating a centralized log server with collected logs of the firewall.

Sheikh teaches gathering logs from a firewall and transporting them and archiving them in a central server, [0082].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the logs of Fruend in the central server of Sheikh so that the network wide logs could be inspected and analyzed.

### *Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Syvanne US 2003/0097589.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J Brown



6/08/05



ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER